

## QUALITY REPORT

# Agro Hemp Iberia

TC-2092 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-F9DB6FC7 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 1.4

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
■ Transparency (25%)	0.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
■ Documentation (15%)	2.0

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

## Assessment Summary

The available issuance record is too sparse to support a strong quality assessment. Key elements for additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, permanence, and safeguards are not stated, so the project carries substantial uncertainty and claim risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-2092
Sector	other
Vintage	Recent
VVB	Trusted Carbon
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-12

## Red Flags

- No additionality test, baseline method, or leakage treatment is stated in the available issuance document.
- No buffer pool, reversal history, monitoring period, or verified issuance quantities are found in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.8 / 10

~ The issuance document names an independent verifier, Trusted Carbon, but does not state any additionality test or baseline approach.

- Permanence and leakage controls are not documented: no buffer pool, no reversal information, and no leakage deduction are found.

The issuance record from 2024-12-17 names Trusted Carbon as the verifier, but it does not state any additionality test, baseline method, or baseline reassessment timing. Leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and reversal information are also not found, which leaves permanence and quantification robustness weakly supported.

### Transparency — 0.2 / 10

~ The record identifies the verifier and a recent issuance date of 2024-12-17, but only one document was used.

- Core MRV fields such as the monitoring period, verified ER quantity, and usage monitoring method are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is low because the extracted record contains only one document and omits the monitoring period, verified issuance quantity, and usage monitoring method. The presence of a named verifier helps slightly, but the MRV trail is otherwise thin.

### Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because the baseline method, leakage justification, and any reassessment timing are not found.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim exposure cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Claim safety is weak because the project's baseline approach and leakage justification are not stated, making over-crediting risk difficult to assess. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated, so the record does not resolve whether there is any dual-claim exposure.

### Documentation — 2.0 / 10

~ The extraction confidence is high, but the evidence base is limited to a single issuance document.

- No corrective actions, material findings, or other supporting project documents are present in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is limited by the fact that only one issuance document was used, even though extraction confidence is high. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but the absence of supporting monitoring and methodology documents leaves major evidence gaps.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality evidence found
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer or reversal data stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No safeguards documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full PDD and monitoring report showing the baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, and any reassessment history.

→ Publish verified issuance quantities, monitoring period details, safeguards documentation, and registry status for CORSIA and CCP eligibility.

## Documents Reviewed

- 17 Dec 2024 Retirement Certificate

### Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-F9DB6FC7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)